THEOLOGY

VOL. LXIII OCTOBER, 1960 No. 484

Canons and Character

REVISION of Canon Law in the Church of England started about eleven years ago and is now *in medias res*. But why should anyone trouble to revise it? In fact the revision of Canon Law is not in every respect such a parochial matter as it may at first seem to be. It could bear directly in a number of ways on our society, and especially in those particulars which still bring the largely non-church-going people into personal touch with the priest: marriage: the sacrament of baptism: and even the kind of man the priest of the parish is in himself. To understand why this should be so, one has to understand what the Canon Law was originally meant to be and do.

When the Church of England broke away from Rome at the Reformation, its final shape and character remained uncertain for a long time. But with the accession of James I (the most pedestrian of the Stuart Kings), Archbishop Bancroft, who had a passion for tidiness as well as considerable administrative ability, decided that the time had come to impose upon the national church a body of canon law, capable of being legally enforced. Thus he succeeded in passing through the Convocation of Canterbury in 1604 and of York in 1606, one hundred and forty-one Canons all of which later received the royal assent. These regulations required regular church going; dealt with morals and the correction of vice: licensed schoolmasters: controlled marriage, and burial. And it was the Archbishop's intention that these regulations should be binding on the whole nation; for like most of his contemporaries, he never envisaged a time when a man could be a full citizen without at the same time being a member of the established Church. But confronted by the Stuart despotism, the judges refused to enforce the canons on the laity because they had not been endorsed by Parliament.

The subsequent fate of the Canon Law of 1604 was therefore what might have been expected. Where the canons demanded too much of weak human nature, particularly from ordinary citizens, or invaded what came to be thought of as secular affairs, they amounted to little more than a counsel of perfection, or became a dead letter. A practical, if not altogether inspired, common-sense brought about this compromise; and the secular liberal society which arose after the Restoration cared for none of these things.

Yet new historic situations condition people in new ways; and the challenge of modern unbelief, with its accepted separation of sacred and secular, has made the Church more self-conscious, perhaps more introverted, and this has led again to a greater interest in its own domestic life. *Unable to discipline the nation, the Church now tries*

[1] Broadcast on the B.B.C. Third Programme, 5 July 1960.

to discipline itself. Hence the abortive attempts to revise the older canon law towards the end of the last century, and the present large-scale operation which, so far as both Convocations are concerned, has brought forty-four canons to their final stage, and seventy to stage two. Yet such law-making in the Church of England is still beset with difficulties greater than and different in kind from what would be met with in some other communions—for example in the Church of Rome.

(1) First, the Church of England, because of its particular history and the manner of its Reformation in the sixteenth century, is a *comprehensive* Church. This does *not* mean, as is often supposed, that it always felicitously discovers the mean between two extremes. Indeed, quite the reverse. It means that it is prepared to *contain* extremes: "to let both grow together until the harvest". But such diversity does not easily make for a tidy system of agreed law: particularly when differences are held with deep conviction as a matter of conscience. In such a situation, the best thing is to keep law down to an absolute minimum: for on the whole this is better than trying to discover a slick and ambiguous formula which really satisfies no one.

Now the present revisers have certainly done their best to respect the comprehensive character of the Church of England. Their mistake (without the excuse of Archbishop Bancroft) is an excess of zeal —to be in fact far too prolix; to legislate for far too many contingencies. Is it really necessary, for instance, to give canonical sanction to those who refuse Christian burial to the unbaptized?

(2) The second difficulty arises because in no long-established episcopal church has canon law been *less* formative than in the Church of England—and this for the obvious reason that for over 300 years it has in the main managed without it. The causes of this happy deprivation are many. Not least among them are the supremacy of the Queen in Parliament; the suppression of Convocation for over a century; and the establishment, in the nineteenth century, of the judicial committee of the Privy Council as the final court of ecclesiastical appeal. Just because this court was impatient of nice theological distinctions, it usually came down on the side of liberty. Also, a married clergy entrenched firmly in their country rectories, whose social status grew steadily throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, came to be far more aware of the law of the land than of the canonical law of the Church.

The practical effect of all this was to persuade tolerant bishops, and (more difficult) diocesan chancellors, that on the whole it was wiser to tolerate some deviation and eccentricity rather than to seek a tedious legal remedy—except in extreme cases. But now the question must be asked: will such wise restraint continue if the present revision becomes law? Surely the intention behind the enterprise must be to enforce such law through courts designed for the purpose. The element of legality will loom larger, and may even become obtrusive. Parsons will have to know their book and act by it.

(3) Another difficulty which confronts the revisers is the Church of England's legal connexion with the State. Admittedly, the

Enabling Act of 1919 has in part revised the machinery of ecclesiastical legislation, making it somewhat more free of Parliament; but it is certain that the law officers of the Crown will be scrutinizing the proposed canons to see if any of them affect the rights of Her Majesty's subjects. Those which do so will need parliamentary approval: and already certain canons, prohibiting the marriage of divorced persons in church, have been withdrawn, not because of any change in theological attitude, but from fear of possible repercussions with the State.

The number of canons likely to be affected in this way is relatively small: and the Church has set up its own legislative commission to advise in this matter. It just goes to show how difficult it is for a church, retaining a connexion with the State, and with a large nominal membership, to assert a separate existence. Canon law could lead to disestablishment—and that, of course, would affect everyone.

(4) There is also the difficulty which arises from what is commonly called the freehold of the parish clergy and the outlook and assumptions which go along with it. The Anglican incumbent, the *persona* of his parish, inherits a historic position perhaps unique in Christendom, in which social prestige and, at times, economic power, have added to the "aura" of the priest. Common law has protected his freehold, and in practice he has discharged his duties comparatively undisturbed, free from more than very occasional episcopal control. If in exceptional circumstances he resorted to his bishop it was for advice rather than direction: and he presided over his parish almost as over an independent kingdom.

Such a heritage of independence has, of course, advantages and disadvantages. It tends to breed self-reliant, responsible men, capable of making decisions, and acting on their own initiative. It prevents the priesthood from becoming a separate class, as it is on the Continent; so that anticlericalism is almost unknown as a political force in England. It has also encouraged a strong sense of *personal* accountability, an attitude to office not particularly characteristic of contemporary society, and understandably so, because society is corporately organized.

On the debit side, one must admit, it can also give protection to the lazy and inefficient. Still, the new canons, if they should become normative, might well lead, in a subtle way and over the years, to changes in the status of the parish priest, and as a consequence in his relationship with his parishioners. And they may do this because they bear the impress of an increasingly bureaucratic age.

I am not referring now to the excessive detail in which the canons sometimes indulge and which at times becomes faintly ridiculous. For example we read that, at the induction of a new incumbent, "the Archdeacon or other such person, when he makes the induction shall take the priest who is to be inducted by the right hand and lay it upon the key or upon the ring of the Church door, or if the key cannot be had and there is no ring on the door, or if the Church be in ruins, upon any part of the wall of the Church or Church-

yard . . ." One is appalled at the prospect of inducting an incumbent with his right arm in a sling!

Nor am I thinking primarily of the strange mixture, in these canons as in those of 1604, of pious exhortation—which could never constitute law—with the "gen" that every parish priest ought to know, and with theological statements. But I do point to the more serious fact that the canons require the parish priest to refer an increasingly large assortment of matters to the bishop—matters which many clergy regard as better left to their own discretion.

Some of these are not very important, but their cumulative effect may well prove significant. Let me give three typical examples. Only the bishop is to give permission for Holy Communion to be celebrated in an unconsecrated building: or allow a marriage to take place where one of the parties is unbaptized: or permit a Minister of another denomination to give an address in a parish church. The long-term effect of these, and similar restraints upon the freedom and discretion of the parish priest, may be to encourage him more and more to look to his bishop for direction, and for the latter to intervene more and more frequently in parochial affairs.

It is a fact—and I think, a sad one—that many of the clergy do not regret or resent such paternalism: they even welcome authority, and feel a need for the support which direction brings. But this does not mean for a moment that such a temper of mind, engendered by the psychological climate of the age and the changed social position of the parish priest, ought to be encouraged. To take difficult and embarrassing decisions out of the hands of the local man, to pass the buck always to the bishop, is an invitation to irresponsibility and conceals weakness under the guise of loyalty. It could result in seriously impoverished human relations. The incumbent in future may be less a *persona*, dealing intimately and responsibly with people, and much more an impersonal agent. How often already is he tempted to say to a frustrated parishioner: "Of course *I* would be willing to do this, but the bishop won't allow it."

If the effect of the proposed canons, by subtly changing the status of the parish priest, were to encourage a *new* type of clergyman more relevant to the contemporary scene, there would be no need for anxiety. No one need assume that the old system is the best. My anxiety is that the canons will interfere with the traditional pattern and replace the Anglican incumbent we know not with something or someone better but with a pale imitation of his predecessor—that is, minus his independence and consequent sense of personal responsibility. In the past, the parish priest has been a gifted amateur, needing to cultivate many fields: it would be a pity for him to remain an amateur still, but bereft of the status and even the graces which amateurism confers.

The general drift of the canons in this authoritarian aspect shows the Church of England falling into the pitfalls inherent in an age of technology. Contemporary society does call for far greater planning, far more centralization. It needs to think big, to co-ordinate action and to breed a bureaucratic class. The danger is that it so

easily becomes impersonal; prefers definite direction to the patient and risky assertion of freedom; grows insensitive to the more intimate relations of life. Industrialists themselves are worried about this. Such a general tendency finds support, in an age of uncertainty and disillusion, in a demand for authority. But it is essential that the Church—a personal society—should resist it.

It is significant, therefore, that in the revised canons greater discretionary powers are given to the bishop, who is referred to on some twenty separate occasions. It is for him "*to order, control, and authorize all services*": and no resolution of any Synod or Diocesan Conference "*shall have any effect*" without his sanction—that is, he has an absolute veto.

I am not of course suggesting, indeed I do not believe it, that we have here simply the expression of a desire for power. The problem would be simpler if this *were* true. Some of these powers derive from a more high theological view about the nature of the episcopal office, while others have been current practice for some years. But I am suggesting that *this concentration of authority in the bishop, and the apparent willingness of incumbents to accept it, is symptomatic of the kind of world in which we live rather than the kind of Church the Church should be; symptomatic of the pressure to conformity; of the need to organize; of the fear of individualism and initiative in an egalitarian age.*

Whereas the typical bishop of the nineteenth century (until its latter years) was scholarly and self-sufficient, with the instincts of a country gentleman, his counterpart to-day is more activist, necessarily more peripatetic, endlessly chairing meetings, and caught up in administration. The canons seem to betray an almost pathological distrust of the local man, a suspicion that his judgment may not be sound, that it will give way to undesirable pressures. Uniformity (impossible in personal affairs) becomes the ideal. The fact is that the bishop, because he thinks in terms of a larger unit, may be forced to say *No* when his own instincts would prompt him to say *Yes.*

I have suggested that the desire to revise canon law arises out of a contemporary mood: but what are the more conscious motives, and the rationale of it?

Some churchmen would put forward a simple and factual explanation. The 1604 Canons, they would say, are so obviously out of date; they are irrelevant since they presuppose that Church and State are one. The Church of England must put its own house in order, by laying down a pattern of agreed, accepted, and enforceable law: and it must do this before it presumes to suggest how other people's houses should be set in order. There is such uncertainty about what the law is—so the argument runs—that a few lawless people make life difficult for everyone.

But is this the case? Personally, I see little sign of it. And if it were, how can it justify such an enormous expenditure of time and energy? May it not be that the Church of England suffers from almost the reverse—from a timid spirit of conformity and a lack of

bold initiative in its parish clergy? If creative thinking, going along with purposeful activity, is to be stimulated, it must spring up from below: it cannot be imposed from above.

Thus the real question would seem to be, not so much whether the present canons are in themselves what we would wish canons to be (I am very doubtful if, taken altogether, they are); but whether at the moment we want new canons at all. Are they a genuine priority? Is law-making of this kind an exercise to which the Church of England ought at this time to be so earnestly committed? I doubt it. The very preoccupation it involves diverts interest and concern from more immediately important and urgent problems which the Church ought to be tackling—problems of understanding contemporary society and seeing how the Spirit is already at work within it.

The new canons bear evidence of the imprint of modern society, but they do so in just those areas where modern society does not understand or is afraid of itself. For this reason, the present may turn out to have been a most unsuitable time for laying down a normative pattern of ecclesiastical law, though one may well understand and sympathize with the temptation to attempt it.

Christians must urgently work out again the implications of their faith in a changing world—and they must do so by bold experimentation and pioneering endeavours. To fall back upon a disciplined pattern of conservative uniformity suggests a totally wrong emphasis. Lawful authority will not help the Church to be born anew in the society in which it lives.

So one is left wondering, when we take stock of these canons as a whole, whether it is conformity we value most nowadays: whether whatever gains they may bring are not more than offset by corresponding losses: whether the Church would have been wiser at this time not to swim with the tide: and what cause the present business will in fact serve.

E. F. Carpenter.

Some Features of Philosophical Theology in Britain: 1939-1960

To survey or summarize the work done in philosophical theology during a particular period is not the straightforward thing it may seem. This is due in part to the fact that the subject itself is so elastic: it is hard to say where it begins or where it ends. More than this, it is hardly an autonomous subject at all. Consider it, for example, in comparison with other branches of theological study. Presumably, one could survey a period in New Testament studies by summarizing, relating, and evaluating the principal works published by the outstanding New Testament scholars productive during that period. In a very thorough survey one would also draw attention to relevant or cognate work of a linguistic or archaeological or historical kind. One could point out conflicts of opinion and disagreements

over matters of fact, indicating the grounds for the different views held. A great many of these disagreements would persist only so long as decisive evidence was lacking. If we knew more we could resolve them; or, at least, we know in principle how they could be resolved.

Perhaps it is not really so easy as this, but the contrast between anything like this and the situation of philosophical theology is very marked. Disagreements in philosophical theology are not settled by the discovery of bits of factual evidence. Their causes are many, but they can be roughly divided into two. Some can be attributed to differences of a strictly theological or dogmatic kind. When a theologian like Dr Brunner approaches the philosophy of religion he begins with theological assumptions very different, say, from those of Fr Copleston. Other disagreements (and it is with these that we shall be concerned) arise because of the conflicting attitudes of individual philosophical theologians towards the dominant philosophy of their own time and place. Such disagreements are best understood by observing the relationship (at a particular time or in a particular writer) between theology and philosophy. It is this which could lead one to say that the history of philosophical theology is in great part the history of philosophical fashion and the ways in which that fashion has stimulated certain theologians.

For this reason it is difficult to draw any line of demarcation between philosophical theology and apologetics. The Christian platonists of Alexandria were both philosophers and apologists. Neither term is more appropriate than the other. We see a further overlap when we introduce a third term, Natural Theology. It is often supposed that philosophical theology and Natural Theology are the same thing. They are thought to provide "philosophical arguments" for things like the existence of God and the immortality of the soul. They contribute, many would like to believe, to the armour of apologetic, providing the apologist with his basic weapons for the battle against unbelief. This terminological variety can be confusing, but it need not create grave difficulty. The gravest difficulty for any survey of philosophical theology is the lack of autonomy. Much of the story will have to do with philosophical movements which, in themselves, owe little or nothing to theology. In what follows, therefore, I shall not even try to mention many worthwhile books which have been published in the last two decades. (Omissions do not imply judgments.) Instead I shall try to describe a few features of the dialogue between philosophy and theology as it has been carried on in Britain. This may be as useful a way as any of showing not only what has been done but of what remains to be done.

The year 1939 possesses no special significance for this story. We should have to go back to the early 'thirties to find major works like F. R. Tennant's *Philosophical Theology* (1929 and 1930) and John Oman's *The Natural and the Supernatural* (1931). An adequate account of the 'thirties would have to include work by C. C. J. Webb, A. E. Taylor (whose Gifford Lectures were not published until 1930), and individual books of influence by such writers as John MacMurray and Edwyn Bevan. John Baillie's *Our Knowledge of God*

was in fact published in 1939. Each one of these writers, as well as many others, more than deserves an article to himself. But simply to group them together here (for no more than chronological reasons) is to receive an impression and to make a comment upon the world of philosophical theology in the pre-war or inter-war period. However different a Tennant and a Taylor, an Oman and a Webb, they seem to us now to belong to a definable era. They were all working with or within (or even against) philosophical traditions whose main features had been fixed in the nineteenth century. Idealist, empiricist or whatever, they breathe an air of confidence and security about the philosophical enterprise. However much methods and conclusions might differ, there was little doubt about what the philosopher was supposed to be doing. In his purest moments he was a metaphysician. "I should define philosophy," wrote McTaggart, "as the systematic study of the ultimate nature of reality." What could be more straightforward or confident? Many might disagree with the conclusions of McTaggart's study, but fewer would disagree with the sense of his definition. It was in this kind of definition that the philosophical theologian found his clue. Metaphysicians drew pictures of ultimate reality which might or might not be hospitable to theism. It was the philosophical theologian's task to guarantee the theism, by extending or amending the work of the metaphysician. Theologian and metaphysician might sometimes look askance at one another, but in the way that brothers do, not as total strangers.

It is perhaps ironic that the philosophical traditions upon which the philosophical theologian depended were already falling apart, quite perceptibly in the 'twenties and very markedly in the 'thirties. Bertrand Russell and G. E. Moore had long been at work, Wittgenstein's *Tractatus* was published in 1922. Philosophical traditions were being re-fashioned. McTaggart's definition seemed less obvious and a great deal less workable. An account of the causes of this change would involve examination of a great many things: the growing intellectual predominance of natural science, the logical discoveries of Russell and Whitehead, and perhaps also the relative scarcity of speculative metaphysicians of the first rank. However the causes are described, the changes were unmistakable. Only two years after the second volume of Tennant's *Philosophical Theology* was published, Gilbert Ryle produced his now famous paper, "Systematically Misleading Expressions". It was a kind of manifesto of what has come to be known as Analytic or Linguistic philosophy. It suggested that many or most traditional philosophical problems were generated by linguistic clumsiness or *naïveté*. Paradoxes and metaphysical profundities could be shown to be muddles if only we would exercise more care with our language. Some of the final words of Ryle's paper make the suggestion clear.

> I conclude, then, that there is, after all, a sense in which we can properly inquire and even say, "what it really means to say so and so". For we can ask what is the real form of the fact recorded when this is concealed or disguised and not duly exhibited by the expression in question. And we can often succeed in stating this fact in a new form of words

> which does exhibit what the other failed to exhibit. And I am for the present inclined to believe that this is what philosophical analysis is, and that this is the sole and whole function of philosophy. . . . I would rather allot to philosophy a sublimer task than the detection of the sources in linguistic idioms of recurrent misconstructions and absurd theories. But that it is at least this I cannot feel any serious doubt. (A. G. N. Flew, Ed., *Logic and Language*, First Series, p. 36.)

The history of philosophy in this country since Ryle wrote those words has in large part been a series of illustrations of this analytic preoccupation, and whether explicitly or not, it has followed Ryle in supposing "that this is the sole and whole function of philosophy".

At that stage Ryle's manifesto and program looked modest. He was out to clear up confusions. But for certain other philosophers this modest ambition soon merged with something more grand and comprehensive. Continental Logical Positivism was finding ready hearers. Ryle's pupil, A. J. Ayer, was its ablest spokesman. His profoundly influential little book, *Language, Truth and Logic*, was published first in 1936. In a trenchant and uncompromising way Ayer pushed the doctrines of Logical Positivism as far as they could go. Verification was the key word, and the end of verificationalism was nothing less than the elimination of metaphysics. Statements or propositions which could not be empirically verified were simply meaningless. At one blow metaphysical speculation ("the systematic study of the ultimate nature of reality") was emptied of all significance. And with it much of traditional ethical theory and the whole of theology. Statements about the existence and attributes of God could be neither true nor false (atheism was as empty as theism), for no meaning whatever could be attached to them. What then of those who claimed some kind of knowledge of religious or moral truths? "Those philosophers," wrote Ayer, "who fill their books with assertions that they intuitively 'know' this or that moral or religious 'truth' are merely providing material for the psychoanalyst." Having thus disposed of the rubbish, philosophy could turn with a single mind to its proper analytic work.

Ayer's book ran through four editions before the war and was published again in a revised edition (slightly but not greatly modified) in 1946. But by that time the picture had changed. The ambiguities of verificationalism had become more apparent, and the world (even in Oxford and Cambridge) still contained metaphysicians, moralists, and theologians who refused to acquiesce in their death sentence. For philosophy the most important single fact was the existence, ever more widely known and respected (to the point, often, of veneration), of the later work of Ludwig Wittgenstein. This is no place to attempt an account of Wittgenstein's researches. The work and the man have been discussed over and over again, and the discussions are easily accessible in a number of books. (Because of Wittgenstein's extraordinary reticences, it may be true to say that the impact of his work was first felt with greatest force in the writings of John Wisdom.) To oversimplify, we might say that the task of philosophy was coming to be conceived not so much as the elimination as the elucidation of metaphysics. There was less anxiety

about it, more desire to understand why and how it was that metaphysicians had said the things they had. For philosophical theology a great landmark here was Wisdom's article, "Gods", first published in 1945 and subsequently reprinted more than once. It is the kind of philosophical work which defies summarization. The writing is elusive, suggestive, and inimitable. Wisdom introduced (or re-introduced) a stylishness, a sensitivity, and a comprehensiveness into English philosophy which remains unique. For our purposes, however, it is the new questions which Wisdom and others asked about religious belief and theological language which matter most. We have left behind the more crude forms of verificationalism. The philosopher is looking for ways in which to understand the things, often extraordinary looking things, which metaphysicians and theologians have said. It is no news to him (was it ever?) that assertions about God cannot be verified in the way one verifies assertions about material objects. But instead of saying "Meaningless", he probes further. Admit that these assertions have significance. Still, what *kind* of meaning is or could be claimed for them? What sort of evidence, in what circumstances, might count for or against them? Does the believer's belief in God (or the unbeliever's disbelief) have any connexion with how things go in the world? What kind of connexion? Does, for example, the existence of evil and suffering count *against* belief? Could it ever count decisively? If so, how? If not, why not?

The questions lead into one another and open up endless inquiries. At the first level such questions may seem confined to the reaches of so-called Natural Theology, but their implications carry one straight to dogmatics. It is generally said that the deliverances of revelation are of a different order from those of reason, yet dogmatic theologians behave as though discussion of revelation had meaning. If meaningfulness is claimed, then philosophical questions are relevant. What kind of considerations, for example, lead divines to formulate doctrines in one way rather than another? In what sense can a man be said to "believe" something which allegedly transcends his understanding? When the philosophical theologian confronts questions like these he is obliged to re-survey the whole field of theological language. Whether his findings satisfy the sceptic or not, his very research will not leave the inner workings of theology untouched.

This rough outline of the kinds of problems which philosophy sets for philosophical theology would be misleading if it suggested that contemporary analytic philosophy was a single or homogeneous movement. There is no orthodoxy, however much the earlier Logical Positivists may have longed to establish one. Nor is there a single (or "party") attitude toward religion and theology. Many analytic philosophers are not Christians, but some are. In another ten or twenty years it may be possible to say whether the influence of Wittgenstein and others has made the tasks of philosophical theology easier or more difficult. At the moment there are indications both ways. What cannot be doubted is that the contemporary philosophical stimulus has brought a new richness and even new life to

philosophical theology in this country. Nor is the dialogue confined solely to discussions of the "But what do you mean by so and so . . . ?" type. One thinks, for example, of the subtle and penetrating work by someone like Professor D. M. MacKinnon which has been stimulated by recent philosophical debate.

In what ways then has this kind of philosophy engaged philosophical theologians? Not unexpectedly, we do not find many instances of real engagement until after the war. Dr Mascall's *He Who Is* and Dr Farrer's *Finite and Infinite* were both published in 1943 and it is probably true to say of them that they are other than they might have been had Logical Positivism never been preached in England. In different ways and at different levels, however, they still move with confidence in the tradition of classical theism. Dr Farrer's book is sometimes maddeningly difficult, but in its elusive and almost hermetic way it anticipated a great many discussions and arguments which were to develop years after its publication. Professor Dorothy Emmett's *The Nature of Metaphysical Thinking* had a serious concern with some of the issues which had been raised for traditional metaphysical theology, and so did the writings of Professor H. A. Hodges. But if the reader would like to see how the arguments took shape, he can turn to a collection of papers, *New Essays in Philosophical Theology*, edited by A. G. N. Flew and A. MacIntyre, and published in 1955. There is also a further volume of essays, of a more unified and in a sense apologetic kind, called *Faith and Logic*, edited by B. Mitchell and published in 1957. Most contributors to these books are agreed at least in their acceptance of the fact that something like a revolution has taken place in philosophy. Acceptance that is, of the fact that the philosophical atmosphere is very different from what it was, and that philosophical theology must somehow learn how to live in it. It would be impossible to summarize the contents of essays like these, let alone the many others which have been written in the last ten or fifteen years. But it is perhaps significant that the discussion has taken place mostly in articles and papers rather than in full-length books. (The most outstanding exception is Professor R. W. Hepburn's very important book, *Christianity and Paradox*, 1958.) As a result, one sometimes gets the impression that so far we have seen only border skirmishes or detailed discussion of individual points. Professor I. T. Ramsey is almost the only philosophical theologian who has, in print, been moving toward some kind of systematic restatement of the whole corpus of problems which have been traditionally assigned to philosophical theology. Others, perhaps, have not felt that it was possible to work in more than a piecemeal way.

There are others, philosophers and theologians, whose acceptance of the new atmosphere, has been neither cordial nor resigned. One thinks of recent Gifford Lectures by Professors H. J. Paton and C. A. Campbell. One thinks too of the consistent and single-minded stand which has characterized the writing of Professor H. D. Lewis. Or, in another theological realm, a Catholic philosopher like Dom Illtyd Trethowan can deplore the situation (and not as a Thomist, either),

while a Fr Copleston plays the analytic game and uses it for his own purposes.

The selectivity and therefore the inadequacy of this survey has now been fully exposed. We have concentrated on the questions posed by a particular mode of philosophizing and their acceptance or rejection by a few philosophical theologians. We have said nothing, for example, about existentialism. Perhaps, more seriously, we have said nothing about the influence of that anti-metaphysical theology associated with the work of Karl Barth. If this were a survey of living problems and important issues which *ought* to exercise philosophical theologians, these omissions would be even more inexcusable. The fact remains that post-war philosophical theology in Britain has been revived by its contacts with analytic or linguistic philosophy. But the scene is changing, not least in philosophy itself. It may turn out that the 'fifties marked something like the end of an era. A good many arguments have played themselves out. We cannot go on indefinitely repeating and qualifying the arguments and counter-arguments set in motion by verificationalism, crude or sophisticated. Circumstances are more propitious for a more venturesome and consciously metaphysical approach. Even analytically trained philosophical theologians seem to be feeling less inhibited, less anxious about their logical respectability. It would be nice to know what the next twenty years will bring forth, but whatever it is, the field is open.

H. E. Root.

Arthur Schopenhauer's Concepts of Salvation [1]

What other pessimist has elaborated a philosophy of pessimism so thoroughgoing and so finely expressed as that of Schopenhauer?—Father Copleston.

A Christian approach to Schopenhauer is difficult. His pessimistic view of life on earth and his self-confessed atheism are stumbling blocks; so are his uninhibited attacks upon opponents. But a closer study of his doctrine is most rewarding. It reveals that the professed atheism, the cynicism and even the rudeness are a protective shield under which is hidden an intensely sympathetic heart longing for truth, grace and salvation.

Schopenhauer combines two great English traditions which are wrongly regarded as opposed to one another: Empiricism and Platonism. We shall try to indicate briefly how his philosophy starts at the bottom and rises in four steps to salvation. Quotations are from the two volumes of *The World as Will and Representation* in E. F. J. Payne's excellent translation (Falcon's Wing Press, Indian Hills, Colo., 1958) which avoids numerous misleading errors in older versions.

---

[1] September 21st was the 100th anniversary of his death.

1. *Salvation from chaos by insight into strict necessity.* Subject and object, perceiving and perceived, "are inseparably connected as necessary parts of one whole. This whole . . . is the world of representation, or the phenomenon" (II, 18). It is no illusion, but for us the reality, though it "veils" something beyond. Schopenhauer follows Kant in positing further the necessities of mathematics (space and time) and of natural and historical events (causality and motivation). These necessities, the unalterable forms of all experience, can never be falsified by experience. Yet even to-day scientific experiments are alleged to indicate uncaused events; while on the other hand the relation of eternal to phenomenal reality is still often conceived in terms of cause and effect, a mistake resting on the one-sided development of scientific concepts by the great Aristotle and the Scholastics. The simple apodeictic certainty of mathematical and causal necessities, from which that of logic also derives, itself rests on what we must call a super-individual consciousness given by grace to mankind.

2. *Salvation by selfless contemplation.* The essence of the phenomenal world is intimately known to us in self-consciousness as "the will to live", will individualized, comprising all forces of nature. The world is "will objectified". "The will, existence itself, is a constant suffering, partly woeful, partly fearful" (I, 267). Reason in man is originally but the servant of this will to preserve individual life.

Knowledge, however, "can, free from all the aims of the will, throw off its yoke and . . . exist . . . as a clear mirror of the world; and this is the source of art" (I, 152).

For Schopenhauer, his own philosophy provides such a clear mirror of the world. The artist is inspired by the contemplation of the Ideas of all things. An important part of the philosopher's work is the explanation of the nature of those Ideas, and also of the "Idea" of the world as a whole, in terms of reason.

Artistic and philosophical contemplation "is not the way out of life but only an occasional consolation in it". This significant spectacle" is "free from pain" (I, 267).

3. *Salvation by just and good conduct.* Man "finally becomes tired of the spectacle and seizes the serious side of things" (I, 267). Man can discover himself as he is, free from temporal existence, rooted in the highest of all eternal Ideas, namely in the will as existing apart from the perceptual world in perfect wholeness and unity. Like everything else "he has duration in time only by being simultaneously in eternity" (II, 365). But man alone can regain true freedom of action, which is in self-denial and starts with righteous and good deeds. "What the Christian mystics call the effect of grace and the new birth is for us the only direct expression of the freedom of the will. Necessity is the kingdom of nature, freedom is the kingdom of grace" (I, 404). "Just as torches and fireworks become pale and insignificant in the presence of the sun, so intellect, even genius, and beauty likewise are outshone and eclipsed by goodness of heart . . . for goodness of heart is a transcendent quality; it belongs to an order of things reaching beyond this life and is incommensurable with any other perfection" (II, 232). Here we have, in the phe-

nomenon itself, the union of freedom with necessity which springs from the recognition of the I in the Thou (I, 402, 403). Freedom, which otherwise belongs to the "thing-in-itself" only, exceptionally appears in the phenomena of righteousness and goodness (I, 370 ff.).

The merely righteous man still continues to assert self. But because he stops at the proper limit of his own right, thereby doing no wrong to others, he "sees to that extent through the principle of individuation, the veil of Mâyâ", which hides ultimate reality. Genuine virtue, however, does positive good and supplies the need of others.

4. *Final salvation by self-surrender.* Self-denial goes further still. It sacrifices self for the well-being of the world. "The phenomenon by which this becomes manifest is the transition from virtue to asceticism . . . It is no longer enough for the man to love others like himself", but he "recognizes the true nature of things-in-themselves" and "renounces the will-to-live, kernel and essence of that world recognized as full of misery" (I, 380). Self-sacrifice through such superior knowledge is for the few only. Deep personal suffering, however, can lead many to the same renunciation (I. 329).

"We now turn our glance from our own needy and perplexed nature to those who have overcome the world, in whom the will, having reached complete self-knowledge, has found itself again in everything, and then freely denied itself . . . Then, instead of the restless pressure and effort . . . we see that peace which is higher than all reason" (I, 411). Man's salvation is at the same time the salvation of the whole world. Schopenhauer refers to the Veda: "As in this world hungry children press round their mother, so do all beings await the holy oblation." "Eckhardt says wholly in the sense here discussed: 'I confirm this with Christ, for he says: I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all things unto me (John XII, 32). So shall the good man draw all things up to God, to the source whence they first came'" (I, 380, 381).

5. *Critical appraisal and conclusion.* (*a*) *Creation.* Schopenhauer is right in not ascribing the creation of evil to a God of love but to the will-to-live. The affirmation of this will he correctly sees expressed in the biblical fall of man. But he sometimes overlooks the fact that he himself sees transcendent reality as "behind" everything, and that it is only *fallen* man who is indeed "his own work". In a profound essay, *Transcendent speculation on the apparent purposiveness in individual destiny* (Parerga) he admits "symbolic truth" in the concept of a "genius" ordering all things from a timeless world. A positive blessed condition in such a world is beyond his conception. Yet his contemplation of perfect Ideas affords a glimpse of what is to the believer the goodness of creation. He sees moreover human self-denial as a gracious gift from the inaccessible realm beyond those Ideas, which to enter by receiving that grace is his heart's desire.

Shocked, however, by the anthropomorphic theology of his day he does not admit that the symbolic language of faith, asserting creation by a personal God of love, can best communicate the definite re-

ligious experience of a "cognitio amoris dei" (Spinoza) emanating from the unapproachable transcendent reality.

(*b*) *World history and saintliness.* The preparation of human character for a blessed state by renunciation must, on Schopenhauer's own showing, be based on the necessities ordering the world's history. In Christian language, this world is the order of God's love which leads through self-assertion, suffering and struggle, to knowledge, renunciation, saintliness and salvation. The continual birth of new individuals in history is assured by the sex instinct, which is at the centre of the will-to-live. Emphasizing this correctly Schopenhauer does not see that the same instinct is also at the centre of man's sanctification. For love between the sexes is a necessary preparation for the final transformation into a life ruled by God's pure love. A gradual progress in history towards such transformation is rightly rejected. On earth God's kingdom is never complete; it appeared perfectly once only, in Christ. A transient temporal triumph of Christianity on earth is indeed to be aimed at; but God's kingdom for which we pray is not on this but on a transformed earth.[1] Selfless love and detached reason shown in individual, social and religious life is best regarded as an essential *individual* preparation for the eternal kingdom.

(*c*) *Incarnation and biblical doctrine.* Schopenhauer teaches the impossibility of a completely sinless character born into the flux of time. He attributes to the Gospel story no historical but deep symbolic truth depicting the transcendent saving power of a perfect denial of the will-to-live "for people always demanding something founded on fact". Consequently he commends the Docetic doctrine of Christ's phantom-body (I, 405). He is partially blind to the work of God's Spirit on earth, both at its climax of Jesus' birth and in the Old Testament record. He strangely identifies with the shallow optimism of his day the profound Jewish striving for a realization of God's righteousness and holiness. He disregards the fact that Jewish hope grows from immature temporal and tribal dimensions to truly eternal and world-wide ones, very near to his own.

Because of these misinterpretations of the Bible Schopenhauer prefers the holy scriptures of India. But it is scarcely possible to reconcile this attitude with his own description of Jesus Christ "as full of the depth of life . . . who stands before us with perfect virtue, holiness and sublimity, yet in a state of supreme suffering"; or with his own belief in the salvation of the whole world by the holy sacrifice of man enacted in time (I, 91, 381). His interpretations often contradict his own religious longing for a very positive, concrete and personal salvation. Schopenhauer has indeed shown that Indian and Christian saints walk on the same path of renunciation to salvation and believe in the same transcendent reality. But fundamentally he agrees with St Paul that men are saved—be it through one or through many rebirths—by their unity with the one living saviour, Christ (I, 329).

[1] Cp. T. F. Glasson in THEOLOGY, May 1960.

(*d*) *Supremacy of philosophy.* Justifiable pride in his own philosophical achievements prevents Schopenhauer from acknowledging that, on his own showing, philosophy points to the symbols of faith as superior truths. No one has shown more clearly that languages are based on ordinary everyday perception. Truths transcending such perception in the life of the arts, of morals, of self-denial, must use terms in specially adapted meanings. Schopenhauer himself is a master of the communication of higher experiences through illustration and simile. He also knows that no conceptual (i.e. philosophical) explanation is possible for the relation of the inaccessible "beyond" to the whole of experience, or for the objectivation of eternal oneness and wholeness in manifold Ideas, and of Ideas in temporal life. It is vision inspired by grace from above which acknowledges the oneness of these seemingly heterogeneous realities, and only "the eye of faith"[1] sees the supremacy of the transcendent, of God's love. At the bottom of Schopenhauer's inconsistencies is his unwillingness to submit his philosophical insight to the truth of his own inspiration by faith in the "beyond".

(*e*) *Schopenhauer and the scientific age.* Modern philosophy and science owe an unacknowledged debt to Schopenhauer. From Freud and Bergson to contemporary existentialists, rationalists and linguistic philosophers, the central facts of life are seen more and more in emotion and conation, in both the physical and the psychological fields. Philosophical clarification of concepts and scientific research should, however, with Schopenhauer be joined to inspired vision.[2] For salvation from self and from suffering and the unification of all life should be the last aims of philosophy and of science including the examinations of nuclear power and of people's social and political motives. The alternative, restriction of the principle of verification to physical experiment and the abdication of philosophy to materialism, was seen by Schopenhauer in his own time. He prophesied the horrors of individual and national self-will we have experienced as its results.

There is no need to enlarge in this journal on the decisive part played by artistic and poetic vision in philosophical and religious thought; and Schopenhauer's philosophy of art and of music is without a rival.

Both philosophy and theology would be well advised to listen to Schopenhauer. Just because he keeps aloof from religious tradition and starts from ordinary experience, he can show the way of salvation to those who sincerely strive to find a meaning in life. That way is through self-renunciation, grace, forgiveness, and love. Through it we can visualize a reconciliation of Eastern and Western religions and cultures, as well as a reintegration of the secular and religious worlds.

G. Stock.

[1] Cp. L. Hodgson, *For Faith and Freedom*, 1956.

[2] Cp. I. T. Ramsey, *Freedom and Immortality* (1960), who adds the "transcendent reference" to the linguistic technique.

Diocesan Libraries—A Pressing Need

How is the present-day parochial clergyman to pursue his theological reading? From what source will he obtain books? Some volumes he will, of course, buy for himself—the standard books, the obvious "musts". But the amount of money which he himself can spend upon books is necessarily limited. At a Wives' and Fiancées' Conference held last year at Lichfield Theological College it was generally agreed that wives of clergymen should see that their husbands spent £15 a year on books. That sum, however, will hardly cover the total number of books which a clergyman should be reading. Take, for instance, the list of recommended books for Christmas buying in THEOLOGY for December 1959, p. 491. This alone adds up to £14 4s.

	£	s.	d.
Atlas of the Early Christian World. Nelson	3	10	0
F. W. Beare, *The Epistle to the Philippians*. A. and C. Black ..		16	0
J. Burnaby, *The Belief of Christendom*. S.P.C.K.		17	6
Churches, Artists and People. Church Information Board ..		3	0
Grünewald: The Paintings. Phaidon Press		18	6
Edmund Hill, *Nine Sermons of St Augustine on the Psalms*. Longmans		9	6
M. D. Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant*. S.P.C.K.	1	7	6
A. T. Hart, *The Country Priest in English History*. Phoenix House	1	5	0
L. Malevez, *The Christian Message and Myth*. S.C.M.	1	5	0
Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Godly and the Ungodly*. Faber and Faber	1	1	0
Alan Richardson, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament*. S.C.M.	1	10	0
Gilbert Shaw, *The Face of Love*. Mowbrays	1	1	0
	£14	4	0

Yet it could scarcely be said that this list contains all the books a clergyman would have wanted to read in 1959, not to mention periodicals.

Where then is the clergyman to get hold of the rest of his reading material? He will have to make use of libraries. Here the Dr Williams's Library performs an admirable service, making theological books available by post for the cost of postage both ways and an annual subscription. Again the S.P.G. Library operates in a similar way. There are also the Bray Libraries, concerning which Eric Thornton wrote in THEOLOGY, May 1960, p. 203. Some Theological Colleges will lend out books from their libraries to past students.[1]

Yet all these are only partial solutions to the problem of where the clergyman is to procure theological books. Really he ought to have a good theological library within a reasonable distance, where he can himself view the books on the shelves, have a lengthy browse round, examining the literature on a given subject, discover books

[1] This is scarcely a satisfactory arrangement. The books are already in great demand by the students in residence. Moreover, the Librarian of a Theological College is always a member of the teaching staff, who can ill afford time with his already crowded program to wrap up and send out books to past students, even if they could be spared from the library.

which he did not know to exist, and find a number of periodicals ready at hand for his perusal. The ideal solution, therefore, is for every diocese to have its own Theological Library, conveniently situated in some central part of the diocese (preferably, but by no means necessarily, in the cathedral city), which could be available and readily accessible to all clergy, ordinands and lay-readers of the diocese.

A few dioceses already have such libraries.[1] But it is doubtful how far they are adequately endowed. Frequently such diocesan libraries where they do exist are growing more and more useless because they have insufficient endowments for the purchase of new books.[2] A great number of dioceses, however, have no library at all. This is a very depressing situation, which needs to be quickly remedied. I therefore suggest that in every diocese a substantial grant should be made from the central diocesan funds towards the creation of a Diocesan Library, or, in the case of an existing library, its radical development, remodelling and bringing up to date. Is it not right and proper that a certain percentage of the *quota* from each parish should be earmarked for the upkeep of a theological library which the vicar and the curate of the parish can use? This may seem an ambitious scheme and it is true that the cost would be considerable, but it is vital if the parochial clergy are to remain readers of theology. Their own resources are limited.

Alan M. G. Stephenson.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Carpenter is a Canon of Westminster.

The Rev. H. E. Root is Fellow and Dean of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and a University Lecturer in Divinity.

Dr Stock was a Judge in the German Law Courts from 1923–1933. He is a former Vicar of Mountnessing, Essex.

The Rev. A. M. G. Stephenson is Tutor of Lichfield Theological College.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

AN ENGLISH COLLEGE OF PREACHERS

Sir,

The foundation of the English College of Preachers is good news: but is a course of "three full days" really the best plan for its use to the fullest advantage? If the effect of the College is to be widespread, it is evident that any individual preacher will not be able

[1] Two good Diocesan Libraries are the Thorold and Lyttleton Library in the Close at Winchester and the Holden Library (for Ripon Diocese) now housed in the Brotherton Library, Leeds.

[2] The Dean Savage Library in the Close at Lichfield is a good example. This is completely crippled through lack of funds.

to attend more frequently than once every ten or fifteen years: he will arrive on Monday evening basically tired (most of the clergy are, most of the time), with the additional weariness of the concentrated effort needed to clear things up before he got away from his parish, plus the journey: in fact, in no fit state for "three full days"!

In such a short course, there will not really be enough time for informal exchange of ideas, for rest and thinking things out, for experiments with a tape recorder, in technique: for individual help in voice production to cure major faults, and so on.

Surely the course should last eight days? It would be worth the extra trouble of finding someone to do duty for one Sunday—once in ten years.

But if this is not acceptable, then it might still be worth the halving of "turnover", to adopt as a policy that each student should attend two courses of three full days, with a year in between: of which the second could be planned to allow time for discussion of the results of the first, and for following up the particular points brought out.

Turning now to the effects of the College's work in the parishes: the object of the College is to improve the quality of preaching—partly by giving the "know-how", but also partly, no doubt, by inspiring the priest to put more into the preparation of his sermons. The effects are likely to be quickly dulled, and those who attend the courses led to a feeling of frustration in consequence, unless something can also be done to reduce the quantity of preaching required of most parish priests. Would it be possible to achieve this, to some extent, by a modern counterpart of the Book of Homilies? I have in mind the provision, perhaps on a diocesan basis, of tape recordings of sermons.

I am, Sir,
Yours,
JOHN REDMAYNE.

GIRTON RECTORY,
CAMBRIDGE.

DEAR SIR,

Whilst preparing for ordination at the London College of Divinity, I received tremendous help and inspiration on preaching from the Bishop of Bradford and the Rev. D. W. Cleverley Ford (then Principal and visiting lecturer respectively).

For that reason I rejoice, with many others no doubt, over the founding of the College of Preachers, in which both of them will have leading roles. Professor C. F. D. Moule's article on this subject was most informative and helpful, but from it two related questions arise, the answers to which many of us would be interested to learn, I believe.

1. Is it intended, either sooner or later, to seek "official" Church recognition and status for the College, comparable (say) with that of C.A.C.T.M.? Such an important enterprise as this surely warrants every possible support and encouragement. I realize that the integration of the College into the Church's overall administrative machin-

ery could prove a mixed blessing, but at least its very real value and relevance would be the more sure of adequate publicity and recognition thereby.

2. Following from that, is there any intention on the part of the College authorities to seek financial support for their work from the Church's central resources? Whilst there is unquestionable value, both spiritual and material, in the help rendered by voluntary donations, yet for future expansion (especially in terms of a permanent College headquarters) adequate means should be guaranteed and made available. It may be that the fruits of Christian Stewardship now being gathered ought to yield up some of its seeds to plant in this venture, which could, under God, reap a rich spiritual harvest in years to come!

A final point in lighter vein. The Bishop of Bradford is to be congratulated on having gathered such a distinguished and varied *ad hoc* conference together under one roof for two whole days—he qualifies for honorary membership of the Magic Circle for this astounding feat!

I remain, Sir,
Yours faithfully,
VICTOR READ.

2 PANMUIR ROAD,
WEST WIMBLEDON,
LONDON, S.W.20.

MUSIC IN WORSHIP

DEAR SIR,

There are several points I would like to make following the Rev. P. R. N. Appleford's article on "Music in Worship and Mission Services" in your August number.

(1) Light and "pop" type music in church are usually advocated on behalf of (less frequently by) the younger generation. We are even threatened that its use could become general. This would be to ignore the views of nearly all worshippers over thirty, also of a very substantial number (perhaps a majority) of younger people. Even amongst "pop" addicts there are very many who expect and wish a church service to be *different*. They find it hard to respect a church which leans over backwards in a misguided attempt to be popular.

(2) It is curious that Mr Appleford should twice go out of his way to say ". . . if this type of music is not inherently evil . . .". Why does he say this? Does he suspect that there may be something not quite nice about it? Certainly many of the lyrics are degrading and loathsome, as we all know. This gives the music an association which cannot but linger, even when it is cleaned up for ecclesiastical use. There is the constant suggestion of cheap and easy love, love without responsibility. It is hard too to rid oneself of a mental picture of a jumping, jerking, bawling teenage "singer" punishing an electric guitar. Quite apart from the lyrics, there is every indication that the music itself is frankly aphrodisiac. (What do "strippers" dance to?

Tallis? Bach? Britten?) Obviously these criticisms do not apply to all "pop" music, but that they should apply to much of it surely makes the whole genre an offence in the house of God.

(3) We are commanded to offer our *best*, and nearly all "pop" and much light music is artistically, aesthetically and emotionally quite barren, and musically worthless (like a lot of Victorian hymns and anthems). These are not the bread and wine of music. They are the candyfloss, and about as nourishing.

(4) Mr Appleford presumes to say that this sort of music is the "background to all our lives". By thunder it is not. There are still vast numbers of people of all ages who manage to keep it at bay.

(5) While we are about it, why not go the whole hog and render the liturgy into matey journalese, so that all may understand it? We could set the Creed—reverently of course—in limerick form. Or if this seems too sophisticated we could no doubt put it into Patience Strong-type verses. This should help to solve the fashionable and grotesquely exaggerated problem of communications. (I, if I be lifted up . . .")

(6) To return finally to the music, it is no use invoking the fact that sacred and secular music were once of the same type, and that "Abide with me" has affinities with "Nellie Dean" (neither is any the better for that). For better or for worse there is now a great gulf fixed between popular secular music and church music. I am not sure that it is the Church's job to try to bridge the unbridgeable.

If Mr Appleford assures us that solid permanent conversions have resulted from the sort of thing he and his friends advocate, then obviously one must pause before condemning it out of hand. But I still wonder whether even this mighty end can justify such grubby means.

Yours faithfully,
J. P. Jackson.

22 Brambledown Road,
Sanderstead, Surrey.

THE GOSPEL LECTION IN THE RITE OF INFANT BAPTISM

Dear Sir,

Lady Oppenheimer's letter published in your August issue prompts one of your readers to inquire, "What lesson would she herself select for the service of Infant Baptism?" Presumably she would wish to be certain that whatever lesson is read contains authentic words of Jesus concerning baptism. It would be interesting to know what criterion of authenticity she would adopt, and what, in consequence of it, her choice of passage would be.

Perhaps she would be content to retain Mark x. 13–16. It is generally agreed that we have here a genuine saying of Jesus. On the other hand, in the light of modern gospel study, it can hardly be contended that the passage is relevant to baptism. It is a description of

the blessing by Jesus of "little children" for whom there was no question of baptism. Referring to the passage, Dr Daube comments, "There are several examples in Rabbinic literature of the belief that the hands of a saintly person might be possessed of a beneficent virtue" (*New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, 1956, p. 234). Nowadays the passage might be adduced in defence of those parents who desire their children to be blessed by the hand-laying of the contemporary Italian saint, Padre Pio.

But enough of negatives! There is "a time to break down, and a time to build up". Will not Lady Oppenheimer now build up, by telling us what she herself would do in the matter which she has brought into discussion?

Yours faithfully,
EDWARD C. RATCLIFF.

ST JOHN'S COLLEGE,
CAMBRIDGE.

THEOLOGIANS' LANGUAGE

SIR,

The interest of theologians is engaged by the nature and function of language. Probably, to-day, there is a more general recognition than has existed for centuries of the importance of words and of the inadequacy of much of the language which, traditionally, has expressed Christian belief. For one, I should welcome this interest with unqualified excitement, if it were not for one thing: the way in which many theologians use words. Recently, I have been reading a book which is cluttered with such sentences as this: "Schweitzer did not radicalize this insight into a questioning of the objectivity of historical research as such." How does one "radicalize an insight into" any kind of "questioning" other than the agonized one of whether one can bear to finish reading the otherwise excellent work in which such a phrase occurs? However, I gritted my teeth, and continued to read, only to be assaulted almost immediately by a remark about the "meaningfulness" of a particular "methodology of historiography". I am afraid that this (to borrow another of the author's happy phrases) "involved my selfhood" in revolt, and almost I decided not to finish the book.

At a time when the author of *Lolita* uses words with surpassing subtlety, richness, and brilliance in the service of his squalid subject, cannot theologians do better than resort to this kind of horrid and almost unintelligible obfuscation in the service of God? Or must we look upon such hideous jargon as being (if I may speak in Rome as Rome speaks) the normative linguistic methodology of theology? In the latter case, there will, I fear, be many like me who will be—to express myself clearly—radically antipatheticalized.

Yours faithfully,
A. C. BRIDGE.

54 PORCHESTER TERRACE,
LONDON, W.2.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE EARLY LITURGY TO THE TIME OF GREGORY THE GREAT. By Josef A. Jungmann, S.J. Translated by Francis A. Brunner, C.SS.R. Darton, Longman and Todd. 1960. 50s.

THE SOUTH AFRICAN LITURGY. By Peter Hinchliff. O.U.P. 1959. 21s.

Now, after fifty years of faithful service, Duchesne's *Christian Worship* can at last be allowed to retire. Fr Jungmann has given us a book which every theological college student will have to read and will be able to understand. It has two outstanding virtues: lucidity and comprehensiveness, backed by an authoritative display of learning. It originated as a series of lectures, and the need for selectiveness of material and concision of treatment has produced a wonderful clarity of exposition. The study of liturgy can be quite bewildering for the beginner, but here everything is made easy for him, because Fr Jungmann knows where he is going all the time, and keeps firmly to the point without allowing himself to get bogged down in superfluous detail. Nothing is taken for granted: words like "Gallican" and "Mozarabic" are explained at length; the discussion of the *Apostolic Tradition* is prefaced by a brief description of the more important *Church Orders*. But although the book is intended as "an introduction into the manner of worship in the early Church", and not as "a guide to scientific research in the field of liturgical history", it must not be dismissed as a textbook for beginners only. Indeed, it seems likely that many will be guided into "scientific research" by reading it, and will return to it repeatedly for further guidance. Even the expert will find it a handy compendium of recent contributions to liturgical studies down to March 1958.

In this country we are habituated to a high degree of segregation between Liturgy, on the one hand, and "Doctrine I" and "Church History I" on the other. One of the outstanding merits of Fr Jungmann's book is that he refuses to confine the study of Liturgy to the problems of textual analysis, but gives due importance to its *Sitz im Leben*, and to the close relation of *lex orandi* and *lex credendi*. Thus, instead of plunging the reader straight into a discussion of whether or not the Last Supper was a Passover meal, he begins with chapters on church architecture, and "Sunday and Easter in the Primitive Church". Only then does he start to consider how the Eucharist began, and we reach Hippolytus only on p. 52. All aspects of the religious life of the period are touched upon: Baptism. "Daily Devotions of the Early Christians", and the sacrament of penance are all treated at length. So are "The Impact of Paganism", the Mysteries, and "Linguistic Provinces". One of the greatest difficulties in teaching liturgics is to get students to look for the doctrinal reasons for developments in the Liturgy. Now they have no excuse, for Jungmann includes chapters on the Apostles' Creed, "The Defence against Gnosticism", and "Christological Disputes and their Influence on the Liturgy".

It would require a committee of specialists to criticize the book in

detail, but here and there it must be admitted that lucidity appears to have been bought at the price of over-simplification. The most conspicuous example is in the discussion of the *Didache*, chapters 9 and 10. Jungmann takes these to refer, not to a Eucharist, but to a meal, ". . . because the chalice is put first. This is something we find nowhere in the whole history of the Mass. All the accounts of the New Testament also place the bread first." To say this without further comment scarcely does justice to the Lucan narrative. It is stated that the translator has made some additions to the text, and these should surely have been indicated as such. The translation has been very skilfully done, and rarely lapses into such phrases as "comes in question" or "to be sure", which so infuriate the English reader of Barth, Brunner or Cullmann. Jungmann has a pleasant, workmanlike style, and a great power of organizing his material. What one misses is the vivid imaginative reconstructions with which Dom Gregory Dix brought his subject to life: Jungmann never ventures on anything like chapter 6 of *The Shape of the Liturgy*, still less Dix's delightful footnotes. There are no crabs on the altar in Jungmann, and no leg-pulling of the episcopate. But though his is a less exciting book than Dom Gregory's, it is no less interesting. It only remains to wish that a book which ought to be so widely read could be made available at a lower price.

The story of the revision of the South African Liturgy will in part be familiar to readers of Frere's letters. Mr Hinchliff does his best to present a full account of the process, and provides some pleasant pen-portraits of the protagonists. But he is sorely hampered by the lack of records of the deliberations, which is particularly sad when the resultant liturgy was so satisfactory. The controversy over the position of the epiclesis is one that may well blow up again in this country, in which case the present book will provide some useful material.

G. J. Cuming.

Billesdon Vicarage,
Leicester.

Evangelical Conversion in Great Britain, 1696–1845. By F. W. B. Bullock. Budd and Gillatt. 35s.

The Fear of God. By Fred Berthold, Jr. Harper and Brothers. New York. $3.00.

Dr Bullock has given us a very valuable book on the subject of Religious Conversion. He has chosen the period (1696–1845) and the area (Great Britain) because they are especially favourable for this particular field of study. The plan of the book is unusual but quite fitting for its special subject. A book of 287 pages, it devotes 180 pages to biographical data, giving the conversion experiences of thirty individuals, some well known and some lesser known, in the period. In this part of the book Dr Bullock supplies many data that are not readily accessible to the ordinary reader. The author devotes

the rest of the book to a discussion of the subject with special reference to the preceding biographical data. He discusses the psychology of the conversion experience (pre-conversion; the conversion crisis; post-conversion; and special features, such as: types of conversion; visions, dreams and voices; the influence of sex; the age of conversion; conscious and unconscious elements in conversion; and revivalism), the relation of conversion to doctrinal belief, and the validity and value of the experience of conversion. The book thus covers a very wide field.

Perhaps its greatest value for the student of Conversion is its scope and its attention to detail. Dr Bullock has executed his work with characteristic thoroughness, and has assembled with great care a large number of data from various sources. The book is extremely well documented, with numerous footnotes and a useful index, and the whole work evinces a full and detailed knowledge of the literature of the subject. And all this enhances the author's own interpretation of the data he is handling. Serious students of the subject will be grateful to Dr Bullock for this book.

This is not to say, however, that his work is purely and simply an academic treatise. Far from it. He has something very relevant to say to the pastor and to the evangelist, especially in his two final chapters on the validity and the value of the conversion experience. He sums up the matter by saying: "In view of the present obvious need for evangelistic activity, of the limitations of popular education, of the common ignorance of the message of Christianity, of the state of the public mind as evidenced by the type of literature which sells best, and of the tendency towards moral chaos, that genuinely religious man would be rash who would seek to exclude altogether the method of conversion with crisis from the evangelistic program. With all its dangers, that form of appeal is the only one which can reach certain people in certain circumstances." He believes that there is real value in positive evangelistic preaching, "provided that those responsible realize what they are doing, and do not lose control of themselves or of their audiences". He warns promoters of evangelistic campaigns that they must never imagine that theirs is the only pathway to the Kingdom, or that their apprehension of salvation is adequate for all. Nevertheless, there must ever remain a place, though not the only place, for those who find God through the crisis conversion.

The Fear of God, by Fred Berthold, Jr, is an important discussion of the role of anxiety in religious experience. Drawing upon the experience and writings of persons so far removed from each other in time and thought as Teresa of Avila, Luther, Kierkegaard, Barth, and Freud, Dr Berthold discusses both the problem and the positive contribution of anxiety to Christian growth.

To mention some of the themes of the book is to indicate something of its scope: Anxiety and the desire for God; desire for eternal life; anxiety over death and sin; emptiness; anxious longing; Freud's interpretation of anxiety; unsatisfied longing; repression and neurotic anxiety; anxiety as a reaction to danger, and to separation from

the loved object; conflicting interpretations concerning man's natural desire for God and man's total depravity; theology and experience; anxiety and the Word; the image of God in Nature and in Grace.

Anxiety is, of course, a subject much under discussion from various viewpoints to-day, and Dr Berthold's book should find an important place in the literature of the subject. It can be said to be an original contribution in the sphere of theological-philosophical-psychological discussion. The writer is equally at home with psychoanalysts, existentialists, and theologians both Catholic and Protestant. His main thesis is that anxiety is a phenomenon of love, and therefore we can learn much from a study of it about the nature of man and God.

This is a valuable book, deserving of a wide circulation. It is scholarly, yet very readable. It is well printed and has adequate notes and index. Dr Berthold is dean of the William Jewett Tucker Foundation and professor of religion at Dartmouth College, where he has taught philosophy and theology for ten years.

Owen Brandon.

The London College of Divinity.

The Doctrine of the Christian Ministry. By J. Line. Lutterworth Press. 1959. 25s.

Every Man in his Ministry. By B. Minchin. Darton, Longman and Todd. 1960. 16s.

The Reunion of the Church. By L. Newbigin. S.C.M. Press. Second Edition. 1960. 21s.

Everywhere the front seems to be loosening. Static warfare from entrenched denominational positions is giving way, even at the most intractable points, to a more fluid and open encounter. *The Apostolic Ministry*, edited by the late Dr K. E. Kirk, looks like being the last massive production of the Maginot age. To-day, three different sorts of development are taking place. (1) There is a real effort at sympathetic understanding across the traditional party lines. (2) There is a more creative ferment of ideas within each of the denominations. (3) There is gradually being built up a genuinely ecumenical theology which owes specific allegiance to none of the older camps. The three books here brought together represent, roughly speaking, these three developments.

The first, written by a leader of the United Church of Canada, looks at the claims of the historic episcopate with a Reformed but unusually sympathetic eye. It is a remarkably fair piece of writing, though it must be confessed that it does not add much to the debate on this side of the Atlantic. It does not move far outside the established positions, and it offers no help towards the integration of non-episcopal ministries with the historic episcopate. Moreover, while Dr Line advances discriminating (though not particularly novel) criticism of what he calls "the doctrine of apostolic episcopal succession", he nowhere properly distinguishes between those Anglicans

who value the fact of succession (increasingly many) and those who hold a particular, "pipe-line", theory of it (increasingly few). It is not good enough to quote extracts from Gore, Kirk, Temple, Quick, Wilfred Knox, and Fairweather, and assume that they are all representatives of one "doctrine".

Basil Minchin's book represents an altogether fresher approach. It falls into two parts, the first concerned with the diversity of ministry within the Body of Christ and the second with the expression of this in the "doing" of the Eucharist, more particularly in concelebration.

This book is an admirable example of what might be called the new high-churchmanship. Its whole ethos is fundamentally different from that by which Dr Line finds himself confronted. It is "high Church" in so far as it starts from a high doctrine of the Church as the Body of Christ and insists on seeing all ministry and all liturgy as the action of the *Totus Christus*. The authority of the ministry is derived from Christ through his Church and in no way over the head of the Church. There is a strength and a wholeness about Fr Minchin's approach which enables him to write with surprising freedom and freshness about well-worn issues of apostolic succession, authority, intercommunion, non-Anglican ministries, and even lay celebration. At the same time as providing a wealth of historical information (much of it not easy to come by), he is constantly concerned with "the power of renewal". He adduces history from no purely archaeological motive, but to guide us through to the overcoming of the clericalism and professionalism which at present blight the ministry and liturgy of all our traditions. This book could well provide a much needed new image of Anglicanism in ecumenical discussion.

Bishop Newbigin's book represents, as one would expect, the most technically accomplished piece of theological writing. It is a revised edition of a notable essay in ecumenical theology. There are many things in the body of the book which Anglicans in particular could read again to their souls' health. But the new introduction raises three fresh questions which will have to be given very serious consideration in any ecumenical discussion.

The first question is that posed by the fact that "the World Council of Churches (and . . . the smaller councils of Churches) provides a place where Christians can do together most of the things which Churches ought to do, *except* the administration of the sacraments". "What," he asks, "will be the long-term effects of a situation in which everything is there except the centre, in which the most significant relationships we have are those with 'Christians not in communion with us'?" The second question is raised by the fact that the Lambeth Conference of 1958 steered the future of reunion schemes along the lines of those of North India and Ceylon, with, Bishop Newbigin believes, their fatal and disingenuous confusion about what is involved in "supplemental ordination" under another name. His mordant criticisms merit an equally cogent reply before we go any further. Thirdly, he draws attention to the significance of the development within the Church of South India itself of a growing

belief in episcopacy combined with a growing openness to non-episcopal communions. "One can *both* insist that episcopacy is God's will for the Church *and* at the same time acknowledge without any hedging or double-talk that non-episcopal bodies are truly churches." The doctrine of justification by faith, on which he grounds this conviction, is one that is still hardly recognized as relevant to the corporate life of the Church. It is largely to renew the plea for its pertinence that this book is reissued.

JOHN WOOLWICH.

FREEDOM AND IMMORTALITY. The Forwood Lectures in the University of Liverpool, 1957. By Ian T. Ramsey. S.C.M. Press. 1960. 15s.

This is a book to be read through carefully "not once or twice"; the serious reader is to be warned against the temptation to read the retrospect first. Although retaining the form of the lectures originally given, the book presents a reasoned sequence of thought without losing the informality which must have helped the hearers of the lectures to follow Professor Ramsey's argument.

Briefly, the contention of the book is that such themes as Freedom, Moral Obligation, and Immortality can be thought and talked about intelligently, but only by facing the fact that they are not to be considered as things or processes to be fitted in with other such things and processes, but have a status of their own, illuminating, influencing, but not conflicting with these others. There is no pretence to answer the many questions involved in this valuable "loosening-up" of current thinking about some of the great themes of the Christian Faith; but the reader is given an honest insight into the difficulties of avoiding slipshod thinking and false analogies, and is not expected to accept in advance the Christian presuppositions of the writer.

It is refreshing to meet a serious theological writer who in dealing with the relevance of recent science is aware of the danger of attempted "take-over" bids on uncertainty principles and the like. ("We shall always be wise to avoid jumping to conclusions based on poetic paraphrases of scientific procedures," p. 19.) Professor Ramsey knows only too well from his approach to theology through mathematics how irritating and fatuous so much well meaning but misplaced use of the "scientific approach" can be to a sympathetic inquirer with a genuinely first-hand knowledge of science. In his discussion of the concept of "End" in Chapter V, the writer uses the illustration of a convergent sequence to give a parallel to the idea of a series of events leading to an End which itself is outside this series of events. It is not an illustration which will mean much to a non-mathematician, and in the opinion of the reviewer a better parallel comes from the consideration of irrational numbers by the method of a "Dedekind" section of the field of rational numbers, from which a new field of "Real" numbers emerges containing, but not contained in that of rational numbers; whereas the limit of a sequence is still a number which may well be in the field of the terms of the original

sequence, and no essentially new concept emerges. But perhaps this is being too finicky.

There are one or two minor misprints. In the middle of page 18, an impulse is of course the force times the *time*; on page 122, in the eighth line up from the bottom, the n in the numerator in the bracket should be unity; and in the footnote to page 139, Lotze is misspelt.

This is a book which should be compulsory reading in theological colleges, if for no other reason (and there are others) than the fact that Professor Ramsey finds the ultimate clue in the biblical relationship of Man to God.

C. D. Waddams.

Cambridge.

Church Dogmatics. By Karl Barth. Vol. III, the Doctrine of Creation, Part ii. Edited by G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance. T. and T. Clark. 55s.

My wife is at present trying to jettison useless lumber, in preparation for moving house, not altogether without my help. This prompts the rather obvious reflection that the German mind can add, but seems unable to subtract or to get rid of its intellectual and philological lumber. This is further complicated by the ghastly jargon in which most German scholars write. One might expect Barth to have modified it a bit, but no, he has only added a further element of journalese and modern slang and what Baudelaire calls "le parfum de la femme", a typewriter, some chromium or steel chairs, and an odd mirror or powder puff add further to the confusion of those over-furnished rooms. There are signs of humour and of a sense of proportion, but they are only signs, like notices pinned to the curtains that they must come down, or cards on the chairs to say they must be thrown out, but not just yet.

And now the furniture removers arrive to perform their Herculean, not to say, Augean, task. They are Dr Harold Knight, Prof. G. W. Bromiley, Prof. J. K. S. Reid, and Prof. R. H. Fuller. They have given us readable and intelligible English. It requires to be read with attention. But it does not read like a translation. A superficial examination makes me inclined to think that Dr Knight shows a little more ease and freedom than the others, but one can only admire them for the smooth success with which they have accomplished an almost hopelessly difficult task.

And what of this great Protestant Summa Theologiae which has now been made, so far, accessible to the English-speaking public, or those few of them who can spend 55s. on a book? One can only say this much—that Karl Barth is much closer to St Thomas Aquinas himself than he is to any Thomist. Like St Thomas, he has mastered his tradition enough to be able to extend it. Like him he is rather long-winded. Like him he looks at his subject from every side. St Thomas uses the Scholastic neo-Aristotelian logic. Barth uses a sort of Christological and Trinitarian schema, which presides over a more complicated dialectic. It is significant that he is appreciated by really

intelligent Thomists, such as Balthazar, Kung, and Bouillard, however much the less intelligent would-be Thomists may denounce him.

Barth always writes with a certain gusto. We may say of him what Alfred Guillaume says of Ps. 43: "The joy is the joy of self-abandonment in the contemplation of Jehovah present in the place where he has promised to dwell: it is not the mystical apprehension of God that is independent of time and circumstances." Barth would reply that the realities of life show him that he cannot be independent of time and circumstances, and that God in the Incarnation has chosen to reveal himself in a certain time and in certain circumstances. So we welcome our limitations and find in them what characterizes Christ and the Church and the Bible, we gladly meet God where he has promised to dwell, we do not buzz off into the intense inanity of mysticism.

In this Volume we find what (in spite of a warning scowl) we may call Barth's Anthropology (including Gynaecology in its theological sense). We see what he calls "Man in the Cosmos", which we will say (in spite of a menacing growl) answers to what is commonly called Natural theology. We go on to Man in his relationship to God, and to other men and women, the relation between soul and body, and the problem of time and eternity. We are not allowed to forget that Man must be given Faith in Jesus Christ and be inspired by the Holy Spirit in the Church.

Theology must be theanthropocentric. It must not try to produce a cosmology of its own, nor must it accept uncritically any contemporary cosmology, or philosophy. Yet, like Genesis 1, it speaks in terms of the astronomy or geography that is ready to hand, but exercises its freedom to differ from it and to correct it at any and every point. In the same way Barth takes Fichte, Jaspers, Brunner, Goethe and Nietsche, Schleiermacher, Cullmann, and Bultmann (all his friends seem to be Germans, except M. Jean Calvin—and the name of John Knox is not even mentioned). He shows remarkable powers of appreciation of his or God's enemies, and can also criticize severely those who stand nearest to him.

As we have already hinted, Barth follows the line of thought of Gen. 2 and the Song of Songs, rather than the more sober and prosaic view of the relation between the sexes which we find in the rest of the Old Testament and (strangely enough) in all the New Testament.

On p. 585 we find first quite a strong doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration and then an attack on the "questionable practice of infant baptism". It goes along with Barth's late hankerings after a congregational in preference to a presbyterian system. St Paul said: "Neither circumcision nor uncircumcision but a new creature." Barth is inclined to alter this into "Not circumcision but uncircumcision", as if by this contrivance of his own he could come to the aid of the Word and the Spirit. The poor man cannot get away from his own tradition any more than we can. He has not yet, as far as I know, issued any pronouncement on the subject of priestesses, one can rather imagine him saying: "Why not, but then also why?"

Those who have the *Church Dogmatics* have a sort of Theological

Summa or Encyclopedia which gives the answer to almost every problem, if only you know where to look for it, and how to interpret it. Anti-Barthians, incidentally, will find that all the objections they have brought are more than met. Like St Thomas, Barth is generally very sound in his judgments, and in most respects is Chestertonially Orthodox, since the Protestants think him too Catholic and the Catholics think him too Protestant, the Orthodox consider him too liberal and the Liberals imagine him to be too orthodox.

We genuine Anglicans, of course, snap our fingers at such systematists. The rowers have their ears stopped with the wax of invincible ignorance—but a few are bound to the mast and yet have ears open to the Siren Songs, and they are as glad to know what song the Sirens sang as they are to have been prevented from landing on their deadly rocks.

Cosslett Quin

Billis Rectory,
Co. Cavan.

Protestantism. By George H. Tavard. Burns and Oates. 1960. 8s. 6d.

The Church To-day. By J. W. C. Wand. Pelican Books. 1960. 3s. 6d.

Call to Worship. By Neville Clark. S.C.M. Press. 1960. 7s. 6d.

The Making of the Church. By J. G. Davies. Skeffington. 1960. 21s.

George Tavard's book was originally written in French, and has been translated with a new chapter written especially on the subject of Anglicanism. It is intended primarily for Roman Catholics, but is written with a view to non-Roman Catholics also. Fr Tavard has made a most valiant effort to be eirenic and fair to the Protestant point of view. Particularly in his chapter on the Reformation, he is very ready to admit both that there were real errors to be reformed, and that what the Reformers said was largely true as far as it went. Unfortunately the total effect is not in fact to convince those who are not Roman Catholics that their position has been fairly considered. I think there are two reasons for this: the first is that in so short a book he really has not space to do justice to so large a subject as the totality of reformed Christendom. In the two places where I can best check him, the attitude of Anglicanism to the ecumenical movement and the credal position of the Church of South India, he is completely at sea. The other reason is that he cannot admit that there can be any possibility of error in the present doctrinal position of his own Church. This means a constant *de haut en bas* attitude which goes far to nullify his genuinely eirenic intentions. At one point (p. 80) he comes within an ace of saying that whereas Roman Catholics enjoy the guidance of the Holy See, Protestants must put up with the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Dr Wand's book is really of the same type as Fr Tavard's, in the sense that it sets out to cover a vast area in a small space, and that it is written by someone who is trying very hard to be fair to everyone. It is an attempt to describe

the whole Church as it is to-day, presented more or less in terms which will at least be understood by the outsider. Dr Wand makes a noble attempt to encompass his appalling task. I can only record my impression that he has not really succeeded. The first requirement in such a book is that it should not be dull, and his book is rather dull, especially in the first half. Perhaps it would have been better to entrust the task of writing it to a younger man, Dr Wand's prose has too much of the elder statesman about it. He just doesn't seem to speak to modern Christians, let alone unbelievers. And to my mind he simply fails to convey the inside feeling of the Church to the outsider. Perhaps it can't be done; but a more original presentation of the subject might have come nearer success.

I confess that I began reading Neville Clark's book in a spirit of patronage ("Well, just fancy a Baptist writing in this way about liturgy and worship!"), but I ended it with a feeling of nothing but admiration. It is the seventeenth issue in the S.C.M. Press series "Studies in Ministry and Worship", and it must be one of the shortest of them, as it contains only sixty-seven pages. It is addressed primarily to members of the Free Churches, and is a reasoned and enthusiastic presentation of the case for a liturgical framework for Free Church worship. He is absolutely firm that the Eucharist in its second century shape must be the norm of worship. All his suggestions have been tried out by himself (Rochester Baptist Church must have an extraordinarily enlightened set of deacons!), and he is fully aware of the difficulties and obstacles which the course he advocates will encounter. Such a book as this makes an Anglican living in Northern Ireland wonder: if this sort of worship becomes anything like the norm in Free Church churches, and if the Church of Ireland refuses to budge an inch from the mid-Victorian evangelical externals which she imposed upon herself in 1870, what becomes of our proud boast that our worship is more catholic than theirs? J. G. Davies' book begins inauspiciously with a description of Pentecost that seems to have been taken from one of those sentimental American books of religiosity that get in one's way when one wants to find something interesting in the average religious book shop. Peter is described as a "bluff fisherman" and he explains to the crowd that it was "too early in the day for them to have consumed any great quantity of alcohol". But despite this pawky beginning, Dr Davies soon gets into his stride and gives us an admirable account of the origin and growth of the Church during the first five centuries. His task also is a vast one, but he accomplishes it more successfully than either Fr Tavard or Dr Wand because he knows how to introduce telling details and quotations from original documents. The book is one in the series called "The Seekers' Library"; this explains the surrealist dust cover, calculated, I should think, to give any seeker a nightmare. But no doubt the aim is to show that this is a modern, up to date book. So it is, in the best sense of the word.

Anthony Hanson.

St Anne's Cathedral,
Belfast.

GNOSTICISM AND EARLY CHRISTIANITY. By R. M. Grant. Columbia University Press and O.U.P. 1959. 31s. 6d.

THE SPIRITUAL GOSPEL. By M. F. Wiles. Cambridge University Press. 1960. 25s.

FAITHFUL WITNESSES. By E. R. Hardy. Lutterworth Press. 1960. 2s. 6d.

R. M. Grant, a Chicago Professor noted for his erudition and his wide acquaintance with the literature of the ancient world, the eminent son of an eminent father, has written an important and valuable study of Gnosticism. Roughly speaking, whereas hitherto scholarship had tended to suggest that early Christianity was influenced by Gnosticism, a basically Hellenistic trend of thought, this author maintains that Gnosticism was influenced by early Christianity. In accordance with a line of thought followed by several contemporary scholars (notably Daniélou in his *Théologie du Judéo-Christiansme*), and inspired by recent discoveries of Gnostic documents, Grant puts forward the theory that Gnosticism derived from the collapse and disillusionment of apocalyptic Judaism, and appeared first as a fundamentally Jewish and Jewish-Christian phenomenon in the early second century A.D. If this theory, even in a modified form, wins acceptance, it will have far-reaching consequences, one of which will be the collapse of one of the major assumptions upon which Bultmann has based his interpretation of the New Testament, for the New Testament writers can hardly have been influenced by a Gnostic movement which did not exist in their day; on the Christian conception of the descent of Christ from Heaven, for instance, Grant can write, "there is no reason to suppose that it reflects an earlier Gnostic doctrine about the descent of a redeemer, especially since there is no evidence that such a doctrine existed" (p. 69). Inevitably, all the details of the author's handling of his varied and often fragmentary material will not please everybody. The identification of the Dositheans (pp. 91–2) with the Qumran community (that Open-Sesame used to-day to solve all problems and explain all origins) is unconvincing; why should not ὁ ἑστώς mean ὁ προεστώς, which is Justin Martyr's word for bishop, reflected in Cyprian's later term *praepositus*? Grant does not seem to have explored Tertullian's *Adversus Marcionem*, that rich mine of information on Marcion and his ways. And his handling of the New Testament evidence in his last chapter seems scrappy and hasty. But that this is a book which must be read and digested by all who are concerned with Christian origins, and that it is written by one who has made himself a master of the subject, there can be no doubt.

The Spiritual Gospel is a book which sustains creditably the Cambridge tradition of scholarship, carefully erudite, painstakingly accurate, widely informative, and, in a manner not altogether alien to the Cambridge tradition of scholarship, sometimes rather dull. It gives an account of the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the early Church generally, but particularly in the works of Origen, of Chrysostom, of Theodore of Mopsuestia and of Cyril of Alexandria.

Much light is thrown on the thought of the Fathers, but (surprisingly) virtually none at all on the Fourth Gospel. Chapters VII and VIII, on Christological interpretation in the third and fourth centuries and in the thought of Theodore and Cyril, are particularly illuminating for the understanding of the development of Christian doctrine. Then, having traced the varying history of exegesis of this Gospel, Mr Wiles in his last chapter, where the reader is expecting at least twenty pages discussing the vast and fascinating question raised by this work, neatly side-steps the whole issue in three pages! Were the Fathers really interpreting the Gospel? Did they find their Christology there, or read it into the words of the Gospel? Why is it that in their exegesis, as the book shows, they hardly ever quite hit the target? No light is thrown upon this really fundamental question in this work. Hamlet is without its last act.

The World Christian Books series will be enriched by its latest example, *Faithful Witnesses*, the translation, with an introduction, of a number of early Acts of Martyrs. The translation of the text of the Scillitan Martyrs and the Passion of Perpetua alone make this work worth acquiring by libraries whose readers are not all Latin scholars.

R. P. C. Hanson.

University of Nottingham.

Friedrich von Bodelschwingh—A Life Story from German Church History. By Martin Gerhardt and Alfred Adam. Verlagshandlung der Anstalt, Bethel. (13.50 DM.)

While Inter-Church Aid was still Christian Reconstruction in Europe, I went under its auspices to spend a month at the Theologische Hochschule in Bethel, lecturing, holding seminars and generally "mixing in". This was a most enjoyable, exacting and schizophrenic existence.

On the one hand there was the College. Among the staff were such notable figures as Dr Friedrich, now the editor of the famous Wörterbuch, and Dr Hans Heinrich Wolf, now head of the Ecumenical Institute at Bossey; there were others, unknown perhaps outside their own country, but whom I remember well; I think, for instance, of Girgensohn, who lectured in Practical Theology (Pastoralia) at great speed and with a provincial accent hard for a foreigner to follow, although to try was well worth the effort. The students (men and women) included young men who had served as anti-aircraft gunners at fifteen and a half, war widows, and at least one member of the expatriated East Prussian nobility who had been a high Staff Officer under von Kluge on the Russian front and who expounded to me with great clarity the problems of conscience raised for the officer class under Hitler. Some students had escaped illegally from the Russian Zone to seek training and ordination and were preparing to return equally illegally to minister in their own place. A more "contemporary" microcosm of the Church could hardly be imagined.

On the other hand the College was set in the midst of the well-known village or community peopled very largely by epileptics. Here what struck me as the German equivalent of Victorianism reigned supreme—an atmosphere of naïve paternalism in the very best Christian sense.

This double foundation embodied exactly the double element of progressive and conservative which emerges from this biography (of which only the second volume is to hand). The activities of which we read include von Bodelschwingh's pioneer efforts in the field of vagrancy, unemployment and working-class housing in the last twenty years of the last century, as well as the foundation and development of the community (with its sometimes bathetic and sometimes inspired biblical naming of the various houses) and of the Theological College.

The book is a fitting tribute (although, alas, one of true Teutonic length) to one who could best be described by the untranslatable word "grossartig", i.e. a mixture of "generous", "far-seeing" and "larger than life"—in some ways, perhaps, not unlike Schweitzer, though his views and interests were very different.

JOHN MONTAGUE.

CHESHUNT.

SHORTER NOTICES

SANDALS OF THE MOSQUE. By K. A. Cragg. S.C.M. Press. 1959. 12s. 6d.

THE HISTORY OF RELIGIONS. M. Eliade and J. M. Kitagawa (eds). University of Chicago Press. 1959. 40s.

THE WORLD'S LIVING RELIGIONS. By R. E. Hume. T. and T. Clark. 1959. 21s.

HINDUISM. By S. Lemaître. Burns and Oates. 1959. 7s. 6d.

GOTAMA BUDDHA. By K. J. Saunders. Serampore College and Christian Literature Society. 1959. Re. 1.50.

BUDDHISM IN CHINESE HISTORY. By A. F. Wright. Stanford University Press and Oxford University Press. 1959. 25s.

A leading London bookseller recently commented that he sold more books on non-Christian religions to the general public than he did books on Christianity; and the recent appearance of these six books underlines his experience. There is a more widespread curiosity among the average British reader about religions other than that of his forefathers than many churchmen care to face. Christian theology is as much in the melting pot as ever, despite the fashion for neo-orthodoxy current in narrower Christian circles. The clergy and the lay leaders of the Church ignore this fact at their peril.

The World's Living Religions is a revised reprint of the late Dr

R. E. Hume's useful but perhaps often too simplified textbook, first published in 1924. For the student new to the subject it does, however, give a clear general conspectus, not the least valuable feature of which is its brief but representative selections from the sacred books of the eleven leading world faiths. The Senate of Serampore College has reprinted in its "Christian Students' Library" Dr K. J. Saunders' *Gotama Buddha*, which, although written in 1922, is a scholarly, sympathetic and well-written survey, which will be of interest to a wider circle of readers than the Indian divinity students for whom it is primarily intended. Mlle Lemaître's little volume, in "Faith and Fact" books, is a translation from one of the French "Je sais-Je crois" series. The extensive list of contents is far too sketchily dealt with in the actual text to make the book anything more than the slightest introduction, though an expert one even so. It is ironical that, although the book is entirely on Hinduism and contains barely a reference to Christianity, it nevertheless bears an *imprimatur*! Mr Cragg's *Sandals at the Mosque* in the "Christian Presence" series is an attempt, out of a lifetime's missionary work in the Muslim world, to interpret to the ordinary Christian reader the common ground and the differences between Christianity and Islam. A glossary of Islamic terms has been thoughtfully appended. Despite much that is excellent in this book, the figure of the sandals strikes the reader as unduly forced; and the style at times wordy and awkward. For example, the comment that "the Early Church, with apologies to Aristotle, seems to have been a very peripatetic affair" is not only faulty syntactically but also feebly and irrelevantly facetious. This kind of thing spoils an otherwise interesting essay.

The symposium *The History of Religions* is a larger work consisting of essays in methodology in this problematical subject by eight scholars of international standing. The volume is dedicated to the memory of the late Joachim Wach, himself an eirenical Christian historian of religions. The quality of the papers varies considerably. Inevitably the inter-religious co-operation envisaged by this book tends to presuppose that the Christian revelation must be interpreted on liberal, humanistic lines. It might be a good thing for all bishops and other leaders of Christendom, as well as the more conventional type of Christian theologian, to read this book, if only to realize that the view-points here taken are more widely held than they imagine. What is often regarded by the orthodox Christian as an outmoded, late nineteenth-century *Religionsphilosophie* is in fact very much alive and up to date.

Dr Wright's *Buddhism in Chinese History* is a more specialized work, based on special lectures given in the University of Chicago. It is a compact and lucid study of the way in which Buddhism has transformed Chinese culture over the last eighteen hundred years. Buddhism has in the past provided the more specifically theological content of the strange amalgam of Chinese religion; but Dr Wright warns us that we must never suppose, as some have done, that, once introduced, Buddhism became part of a great static Chinese civilization.

Buddhism, like Christianity, Islam and the indigenous religions, has been used by the Chinese state through its long history to suit its own ends. There is, therefore, nothing particularly new in the attitude of the present Communist régime towards the religions of China. This book is well printed and has eight attractive illustrations.

University College of North Wales, Bangor. D. W. Gundry.

Hosea (Torch Commentary Series). By G. A. F. Knight. S.C.M. Press. 1960. 9s. 6d.

Isaiah 1–39 (Epworth Preacher's Commentaries). By J. Y. Muckle. Epworth Press. 1960. 12s. 6d.

St John (Tyndale Commentaries). By R. V. G. Tasker. Tyndale Press. 1960. 9s. 6d.

Philippians (Tyndale Commentaries). By R. P. Martin. Tyndale Press. 1959. 8s. 6d.

Pastoral Epistles and Philemon (Torch Commentary Series). By A. R. C. Leaney. S.C.M. Press. 10s. 6d.

St Paul and his Message. By A. Brunot. Burns and Oates. 1959. 7s. 6d.

The two Old Testament commentaries in this batch stand in the sharpest contrast. Mr Muckle seems as determined to treat the Old Testament as a Jewish book as Mr. Knight to remember that it forms part of the Scriptures of the Christian Church. To the question which readers of the Old Testament continually put, "In what sense is the Old Testament a Christian book?", Mr Muckle would seem to answer, "It isn't, though it is a legitimate source of sermonic illustrations for a Christian preacher".

By the light of Isaiah's teaching we may walk the straighter, but that Isaiah sheds light on Jesus Christ is, for Mr Muckle, a dubious proposition.

"What emerges from this is that *prediction is not of the essence* of Hebrew prophecy" (p. 63). Oh dear! Alas, that this ageing *faux pas* still survives, and survives shrilly, for the italics are the author's.

Professor Knight, on the other hand, comes to his study of Hosea not only for light upon Hosea's circumstances and message but also for light upon Jesus Christ. He has written an admirable introduction to the book, containing brief and meaty sections upon such matters as "Hosea's Great Words", "Hosea's view of Sin", "Hosea and the New Testament". One may differ from Professor Knight as to what Hosea (or his editor) meant and one may sometimes wonder whether this or that passage really does provide this illumination of Christ. But in my judgment it is better to provide an interpretation which is good Christology, though it may be challengeable Hosea, than one which, though technically good Hosea, is Christologically barren, for the Old Testament is the Christian Church's book, speaking of Christ.

A reader will find that many of his difficulties about the text of Hosea remain unsolved; but this was inevitable if the commentary was to be untechnical. Enough, however, is said, and said concisely and clearly, to enable a reader to find in Hosea nourishment for his prayers and his life.

Professor Tasker is a bold man to essay a commentary on St John in one small volume. In commenting upon a book whose poverty of vocabulary and style yet carries uncountable wealth of material, how is the scholar to avoid a comparative poverty of illumination borne upon a rich flow of words? Professor Tasker has not solved this difficulty.

"What we need to be assured about is that the Fourth Gospel contains not the imaginative reflections of some second-century mystic, but the testimony of one of the original apostles." The first section of the introduction discusses the authorship, therefore. I hope that the time will come when the question of authorship will be relegated to an appendix at the end of a commentary and that the introduction will contain an emphatic insistence that the authority of the Fourth Gospel (or of any other book in the New Testament) derives from the Church in the first place and not from the credentials of the author. It is no doubt true that the Church admitted the Fourth Gospel into its Scriptures because it supposed it to have been written by St John; but it has also to be remembered that the Church admitted it because its contents matched the Church's tradition as to what apostolic testimony proclaimed. It is not ultimately authorship that matters but rather the Church's declaration by the admission of it into its Scriptures that its contents conform with the Church's apostolic tradition.

The commentary on Philippians in the same Tyndale series is a more distinguished contribution to the understanding of the New Testament. Mr Martin has read widely and made himself so much master of the epistle that what he has written is far more than a potted essence of commentaries. It deserves a place among the lasting commentaries.

The lexicon and the concordance have been at the author's elbow. He has used them with discrimination and without parade. The commentary is manifestly the work of a pastor who has learnt the meaning of "the fellowship in the gospel" both from a study of St Paul and also from his work with a congregation.

Mr Leaney's commentary on the Pastorals and Philemon aims less high than Mr Martin's. Its notes are briefer, aiming rather at whetting the appetite than at satisfying it. The large number of cross references is a good feature. The introduction is balanced and up-to-date.

Fr Brunot's little book on St Paul is a gem. It might puzzle a beginner, for it is selective of the material. But it is a brilliantly organized selection. The scope of the book is made plain by the chapter headings: I, The Enemy of Christ; II, The Revelation of Christ; III, The Hope of Christ: the epistles to the Thessalonians; IV, Everyday life with Christ: epistles to the Corinthians and Philippians; V, Salvation through Christ: epistles to the Galatians and Romans; VI, The Lordship of Christ: epistles to the Colossians and

Ephesians; VII, Faithfulness to Christ: epistles to Titus and Timothy.

The quotations from the Bible come from a translation unfamiliar to the non-Roman ear; but that may be no bad thing. Nothing else indicates the book's *provenance*. There is no polemic, there are no back-handers; there is only a profound love of Paul and of the Christ of whom Paul so lovingly writes.

F. C. Synge.

Christchurch, New Zealand.

The Borderland. By Roger Lloyd. George Allen and Unwin. 1960. 16s.

Canon Roger Lloyd, who has spent a lifetime writing books and articles that have made many rough places plain, here makes his plea for more Spirit-inspired writing, and invites us to consider that great company of men and women in every age who have been concerned to interpret theological truth in terms palatable to the non-expert.

Canon Lloyd confines himself to a discussion of English Literature. He does not discuss writers like Blake and Coleridge, but he has some new and unusual things to say about Shakespeare. His main purpose is to take a book like *Tom Brown's Schooldays*, and to show how Arthur's experience of desolation leads to a vision of the Communion of Saints. And with a writer like Emily Brontë, he shows how an author may be possessed by a mystical vision and impelled to reveal it in prose and poetry. Canon Lloyd finds to his surprise little enough literature that expresses the doctrine of the Incarnation. And he reserves special praise for Caroline Noel's hymn, "At the Name of Jesus", as giving in three of its stanzas a supreme definition of that cardinal doctrine. His reference to this hymn makes up for its absence in the latest, almost exhaustive, documentary on hymns recently published by the British Council.

This is a stimulating book and, because of that, gives one the privilege of questioning Canon Lloyd's argument. Is there after all any need to justify literature, or to see it in terms of faithfulness to doctrinal truth? And to what extent are we supposed to define the Muse of Inspiration? May not some readers be content to believe that great literature teaches enough, and is inspired enough, simply by being itself?

Michael Barney.

London.

St Francis of Assisi. His Life and Writings as recorded by his contemporaries. Translated by Leo Sherley-Price. Mowbrays. 1959. 15s.

The Mirror of Faith. Translated by Geoffrey Webb and Adrian Walker. Mowbrays. 1959. 6s.

Studies of the Spanish Mystics. Volume III. By E. Allison Peers. S.P.C.K. 1960. 32s. 6d.

There never was and probably never will be again any following of the gospel so heartbreakingly literal as that of St Francis. But what does he mean to the modern world? What do "holy humility, pure simplicity, devout prayers, and devotion to Lady Poverty" mean in an aristocracy of technicians, as we have heard our world described? How reconcile his dread of learning with simplicity to-day? Was Francis naïve or was he the master-quizzer of Christendom? These are some of the questions that pour into the mind when confronted again with his genius, and it would seem that the future health of Christendom is going to depend much on the validity of the answers given.

The present translation of *The Mirror of Perfection* and St Francis' own writings is pleasantly done, and catches the questing insistence of his spirit, although the version of his *Hymn to the Sun* doesn't quite succeed. There is, however, one line of pure lyricism in the book. To write of "French melodies and the murmurs of God's voice" in juxtaposition is perfect and worth all the rest of the *Mirror*. The plates are excellent, and the reproduction of the Subiaco portrait makes Francis credible. We have seen his like occasionally in Redbrick and Oxbridge.

If it is true that many come to the Faith via the classical Christian writings, their retranslation into intelligible idiom is as urgent and prominent a work of the Spirit in this century as the englishing of the Bible. And one must be grateful for this small treatise among them, perfect in its way, admirably rendered, but definitely to be sampled only by those for whom the penny has dropped. The modern agnostic or even the seeker of good will could only find its rigid conception of authority infuriatingly unhelpful. But then Abelard must have seemed a terrifying portent at the time William wrote. And talking of portents, have we not two minor ones here, of an ecumenical kind, two imprimatured books published by Mowbrays?-

The splendour of comets is commonly in their tails, even though there could be no tail without the head. Without the twin head, St Teresa and her friend St John of the Cross, it is doubtful whether Spain could have produced the host of lesser mystics that fill the spiritual history of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in that country, and the pages of Prof. Peers' third volume. Yet an important effect of the book is to reveal afresh the force and magnitude of these two hurtling stars by the very brilliance, variety and number of those who came in their wake.

For this, the book being posthumous, much of the credit must go to and self-effacing editor, without whose labour the work would have remained unborn or appeared without the magnificent bibliography in which it would be almost indecent and useless to attempt to pick holes.

The reader is left with an impression of two facts of major interest, the first to emerge being the influence of Eckhart, Ruysbroeck, and Tauler on Spanish thought, and the second, the consistent warmth of so much Jesuit spirituality. A close study of the Ignatian Exercises would not lead one to expect it. Yet the fact of it in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries may be responsible for a sur-

prising remark made recently to the reviewer by an unusually acute observer, to the effect that in the Middle East at any rate it was the Jesuit not the Benedictine chaplains who seemed the more obviously full of love during the Second World War.

But the queries raised are a good deal more important than the facts uncovered. Both emerge from the endless and infinitely tedious schematizing of spiritual states and argument about them. First, precisely how many main types of prayer, as opposed to states of development, are there? Perusal of a book such as this confirms the impression that they are reducible to three: meditative-contemplative; affective-contemplative; and contemplation proper.

Secondly, is there really such a thing as infused contemplation? Or allowing that there is, is it legitimate to say that it is given by God to whom he will and that no efforts of ours can guarantee its bestowal? To say so seems to pitch us straight into the deadliest traps of the old predestination controversy, and to suggest a discontinuity and capriciousness in the methods of God almost frightening to consider. In so far as prayer is the soul's response to the secret attraction of grace, all contemplation is ultimately infused, and the destiny of every Christian of goodwill. These are shocking statements, yet the laws of spirituality seem to confirm them.

JOHN BYROM.

CHEADLE HULME.

BOOK NOTES

The Times Literary Supplement, 22 July 1960, published a letter from Mr Guy Chapman, Chairman of the Translators' Association, from which it appeared that since 1958 foreign books, if translated into English by a translator who is not a Roman Catholic, will not be given the *imprimatur* in the diocese of Westminster, however excellent the translation may be and even when the book in question has received the *nihil obstat*. This is a revealing piece of discrimination. A new edition of *The Priest's Book of Private Devotion,* first published in 1878 and last revised by J. F. Briscoe in 1929, had been prepared by John Stobbart (Mowbray, 21s.). Improvements include a rearrangement of some of the contents, a section headed "Pastoral Ministrations", which gives forms for blessing vestments, etc., in English instead of Latin as in the last edition, and some additional collects. But the omission or translation of all Latin devotions, which is doubtless a sign of the times, seems regrettable. There is a misprint in the page heading to p. 485. S.P.C.K. has published *Advice concerning Cremation as a part of Christian Burial,* approved by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York (6d.), and also two pamphlets designed to encourage common study between Anglicans and Methodists, viz. *Anglicans and Methodists Talk Together* (3s.) and *Church Membership* (6d.), which should be of use at the local level. Hegel is a philosopher who some think may be going to have a comeback. Anyhow, his importance in the history of philosophy and theology cannot be denied, and *Hegel: an annotated selection,* edited by Wanda Orynski (Peter Owen, 30s.), is a commendable introduction to his thought. The selections are drawn from "The Phenomenology of Mind", "The Science of Logic", and "The Philosophy of History". *The Intelligent Agnostic's Introduction to Christianity* by Eugene Rolfe (Skeffington, 21s.) attempts to persuade agnostics to approach Christianity empirically through prayer and eucharistic worship. It is discursive, but should start some lively conversations between believers and unbe-

lievers. In *Politics and Religion* (Pall Mall Press, 2s.) Dr Nathaniel Micklem has packed much good sense into a short essay. Archbihop Lang once described Llewellyn Gwynne as "one of the greatest saints in the Church of England", and those who read *Pastor on the Nile* by H. C. Jackson (S.P.C.K., 16s. 6d.) will be able to verify this description for themselves. During his long life (he was a nonagenarian) he was a pioneering missionary in the Sudan, Bishop in Egypt and the Sudan, builder of two cathedrals, Deputy Chaplain-General in France during the first world war, and friend and benefactor of innumerable service men in Cairo during the second. His letters and diaries have enabled Mr Jackson to provide a vivid picture of his character and of the great variety of events in which he played a part.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

BLACKWELL: S. Mowinckel, The Old Testament as Word of God (15s.).

BURNS AND OATES: Noële M. Denis-Boulet, *The Christian Calendar* (8s. 6d.); Marie-Joseph Nicolas, O.P., *What is the Eucharist?* (8s. 6d.); Irénée-Henri Dalmais, O.P., *The Eastern Liturgies* (8s. 6d.).

JAMES CLARKE AND CO.: Emanuel Stickelberger, *Calvin* (13s. 6d.).

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE (ST LOUIS, MO.): Carl S. Meyer, *Elizabeth I and the Religious Settlement of 1559* ($4.95).

DARTON, LONGMAN AND TODD: John M. Todd (Ed.), *Work: Christian Thought and Practice* (30s. and 21s.); S. J. P. van Dijk, O.F.M., and J. Hazelden Walker, *The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy* (70s.); Martin E. Marty, *A Short History of Christianity* (18s.).

EPWORTH PRESS: Benjamin Drewery, *Origen and the Doctrine of Grace* (30s.); David Stacey, *Is that Good Doctrine?* (12s. 6d.).

FABER AND FABER: E. Stopp, *St Francis de Sales: Selected Letters* (25s.).

HARVILL PRESS: Mircea Eliade, *Myths, Dreams and Mysteries* (18s.).

LONGMANS: M. T. Monro, *The Old Testament and Our Times* (15s.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: Kyle Haselden, *The Racial Problem in Christian Perspective* (15s.); A. P. Carleton (Ed.), *John Shines through Augustine* (2s. 6d.); Bernhard W. Anderson, *Rediscovering the Bible* (21s.).

MACMILLAN: H. Maurice Relton, *Studies in Christian Doctrine* (21s.).

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S HOME: T. S. Simey, *The Concept of Love in Child Care* (7s. 6d.).

OLIVER AND BOYD: Gustaf Aulén, *Eucharist and Sacrifice* (18s.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: Ronald Selby Wright (Ed.), *Fathers of the Kirk* (21s.;) Massey Hamilton Shepherd, Jr (Ed.), *The Liturgical Renewal of the Church* (22s. 6d.).

GEORGE RONALD: K. S., *Reflections at the End of Life* [a series of aphorisms] (10s.).

ST THOMAS PRESS (HOUSTON): T. R. Ingram (Ed.), *Essays on Segregation* ($2.95).

S.C.M. PRESS: E. L. Kendall, *A Living Sacrifice* (21s.); Erik Routley, *Church Music and Theology* (8s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: L. E. Stradling, *A Bishop on Safari* (5s. 6d.).

TYNDALE PRESS: J. W. Harmer (Ed.), *The Scripture Lesson* (15s.).

VALLENTINE, MITCHELL: Ignaz Maybaum, *Jewish Existence* (21s.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON